



MONTGOMERY COUNTY REVENUE AUTHORITY
Board Meeting Minutes – Tuesday, May 23, 2023 8:30 a.m.
Zoom Video Call
OPEN SESSION

Members Present:

Lionel Bernard, Member
Andrew Bridge, Member
Stephen H. Edwards, Chairman
David D. Freishtat, Member
Jonathan W. Powell, Secretary-Treasurer
Jake Weissmann, *Ex officio* Member

Members Not Present:

MCRA Representatives Present:

Justin Bollum, Airport Manager
Patricia Conrad, Chief Financial Officer
Gayle Jamison, Secretary to the Board
Keith Miller, Chief Executive Officer

Guests:

Neal Anker, Associate County Attorney

April 25, 2023 Open Session Minutes

A motion was made by Bridge and seconded by Powell to approve the April 25, 2023 minutes as presented. Carried.

Montgomery County Airpark

Public Comments

Catherine Wallenmeyer, a 23-year resident near the Airpark, voiced her concerns regarding the Airpark. Her written testimony will be incorporated into the May 23, 2023 minutes.

Nancy Shenk, a 47-year resident near the Airpark, spoke about her concerns regarding the Airpark. Her written testimony will be incorporated into the May 23, 2023 minutes.

MCRA Operating Budget for FY2024

Miller discussed the published proposed operating budget and indicated that he received no comments. He then outlined some changes to the proposed budget.

A motion was made by Bridge and seconded by Bernard to adopt the FY 2024 operating budget as amended. Carried.

Crossvines Update

Master Service Agreement

Miller briefed the Board on the operator agreement and indicated that he is moving forward with signatures. The Crossvines will open on July 8.

The vineyard has been planted. Tour with the Maryland Wineries Association has been planned. The Crossvines will host the Governor's Competition and a winemaking open house.

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 a.m.

Stephen H. Edwards
Chairman

Ladies and gentlemen of the Board of Directors,

My name is Catherine Wallenmeyer, a resident approximately 4-miles from the airport. We have lived in our home for 23 years. This airport has a long history of unrelenting noise due to excessive touch-and-go operations in overfilled flight patterns. Neighborhood livability is being destroyed. A few people use this airport to make money and self-enrich, while imposing impacts that destroy our homes.

And who are you... you are the Board. Whether you are paid anything for your time, or do this purely as a true voluntary community servant, the entire community depends on you to provide real oversight of MCRA. You must always be vigilant against being a rubber-stamp for airport proposals. Each of you needs to delve into the details, ask the harder questions, to ensure what MCRA wants to do is consistent with what our community needs them to do.

This airport has a problem. It is highly impactful upon the community, both with air pollutants, with toxic lead sold in aviation fuels, and with persistent noise pollution. The MCRA management fails to produce timely and thorough responses to requests for public records. The traffic pattern is frequently filled to an unsafe level, with students and recreational pilots. If and when an accident occurs, will MCRA and this Board be held accountable for failing to try to resolve these problems?

Every problem provides an opportunity for a solution. Our solution starts with transparency and information. We all need to do a better job of fully informing the community members about this airport. What is the full history? What are the plans? Who is getting rich and who is being damaged, when airport operations expand? And, by the way, it makes sense that the local community should be informed: this airport is in our community, it impacts our community, it is OUR airport. We airport neighbors have a responsibility to help this Board guide the airport management, to ensure the airport fits and serves the community. But we cannot help you, the Board, do your job, if we are left in the dark.

I have a suggestion. In your role, as the Board with responsibility to oversee MCRA and thus the operations and development of this airport, I ask you take action, directing the MCRA CEO, Keith Miller, to provide you with a detailed letter or paper, to be shared with the community. This letter will fully inform you Board members, and also serve to fully inform the entire community, about this impactful airport. Your action should direct Mr. Miller to respond to the following questions and concerns:

1. At a recent meeting, MCRA CEO Keith Miller requested your approval to pursue grants and construct a new hangar at the Airpark. Your minutes do not include any of the needed public information defining intended use or type of hangar to be built.

We cannot properly engage the impacted community if we keep them in the dark, leaving out critical details in the minutes. Will you correct this deficiency?

2. Are you familiar with precisely how this airport is structured? It is set up very much like an undeclared public-private partnership. I have heard from many others who comment, the assortment of legal entities, the layers of lease-holders, and the refusal of MCRA officials to produce records, looks and feels like an elaborate shell game. There can be no transparency and no accountability, when MCRA officials fail to timely share records needed by impacted community members seeking to mitigate impacts. You, the Board, need to direct Keith Miller to produce for you a letter or diagram that concisely defines the entire organizational structure of this airport, from the top of MCRA down to each commercial operator, each flight school, each maintenance shop, each fuel seller. The listing needs to include the business names of each lease-holder, and identify the principal official and email address for each lease-holder. Also, if production of this airport organizational structure does in fact look problematic, like a shell game, we should be ready to clean that up, posthaste.
3. With Airport Master Plans, FAA has a longstanding process to help airports remain compatible with the community. The Master Plan process engages community members, and the end products, including the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) are required for federal grant subsidies. FAA strongly recommends this process on a regular basis, even every 5-10 years, and FAA provides grant monies for this process. Do you know when the last Airport Master Plan process happened for this airport? Do you know the date on the last ALP version approved by FAA's Airports Office? You should know all of this, and you should have ready access to copies of all the documents. And we the community residents should ALSO have ready access. Would you please direct Mr. Miller to provide these records, as well as a clear timeline defining our history of Master Plans, and the complete history of approved ALP revisions?
4. Do you know how much leaded aviation fuel was sold at this airport, each of the last five years? Should you know, and should the community also know, given the toxicity of lead, especially around children? Do you understand that MCRA has precise records on leaded fuel sales? MCRA raises airport revenues using a fuel flowage fee collected for each gallon of fuel flowed at the airport. We need to get rid of this lead pollution, but are we? Can we share real data showing progress (or lack of progress) on reducing leaded fuel sales?
5. Is this Board going to proactively advocate for restoring the ALC? The Airport Liaison Committee was abruptly disbanded when some of us began expressing our concerns. I was told by MCRA officials I ask that this Board advocate for restoring the ALC, and direct Mr. Miller to write a letter stating his position, for or against.
6. Are you familiar with the Vianair Report done in June last year? It offered some critiques and recommendations, including the need to restore the ALC. I ask that the Board direct Mr. Miller to prepare a statement declaring the MCRA response to

the specific Vianair Report content, to include either explanations for how MCRA will address concerns and pursue recommendations, with a clear timeline showing how and when for each MCRA action. Where a report recommendation is being rejected, there needs to be an explanation of why.

7. Lastly, to help reduce impacts and the heightened risk of overfilled air traffic patterns, I ask the Board to direct Mr. Miller to prepare an analysis of how we can impose a landing fee for all arrivals. For the record, in the recent past Mr. Miller has tried to discourage imposing a landing fee, even claiming they are not allowed by FAA. In fact, landing fees are allowable, so long as they do not discriminate unjustly. I have spoken with management at numerous airports where landing fees are imposed.

Thank you, and please include this written letter into the public record.

Testimony before the MCRA 5/23/23

Good morning...my name is Nancy Shenk, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak with you this morning. I understand that you have many projects that you oversee however, this morning I'd like to focus on the Montgomery County Airpark.

I have lived in the Goshen community for the past 47 years. I was a member of the Airpark Liaison Committee from its inception in the 1990's until it was disbanded two years ago, without input from the community or the committee, two years ago. I served as President of the Goshen Community Association for many years and served two terms on the Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board.

As you probably know, the County Council will be voting on a bill in early June to reinstate the Airpark Liaison Committee. The issues at the airpark today are quite different than they were 30 years ago. Thirty years ago we were concerned with the pilots throwing soda bottles and trash out of the cockpits...no joke.... Given the community's concerns regarding several current issues at the Airpark I am requesting that you, as the Board of Directors of the MCRA write a letter to the county council supporting this bill and I thank you in advance for doing so.

I am going to speak to you on two issues of grave concern to the community surrounding the Airpark, noise and safety. Imagine trying to work at home, having a phone conversation or just enjoying the quiet of your backyard, whether you are trying to destress, read a book or hosting a family dinner. In our community, it's impossible given the constant noise of planes circling directly over our homes, revving their engines and flying at low altitude. I filed a complaint several weeks ago where I reported that during a 1 hour time period I counted 30 flights literally "buzzing" my house every 2-3 minutes... I could file a similar complaint almost every clear sunny day.(Note: In the past couple of days, training flights over my home have subsided. I am assuming that it is because the flights are departing from runway 14...given that this is the "preferred" runway on low wind days, the pilots need to be reminded on a regular basis that they need to use it). Unfortunately there is no effective oversight at the airpark . Mr. Miller even reported that there is no equipment and no one is responsible to report the exact number of flights in or out of the airpark or the altitude at which they fly...the numbers in the published reports are merely estimates and in many cases numbers provided by the flight schools. It is my understanding that the flight schools are required to provide data monthly on touch and go's... those numbers have not been made available to the community when requested and I question if that data is being provided regularly to the MCRA.

Several residents surrounding the airpark regularly monitor the flights, in terms of number of flights, altitudes and flight patterns....but when that data is reported to the MCRA officials ,they are told that their data collection is not acceptable.

When I served on the ALC, noise and safety complaints were made directly to the MCRA. The committee was consistently told that no complaints had been filed. I later found out that the ALC had been misled.....community members were filing complaints, yet the committee was not provided that information. The community now has the ability to file noise complaints on line. However, the noise complaint website is often down. And when data is requested, the only data reported is from households that have filed multiple complaints. The households that only report

1 complaint are not included in the data. And the households that continually file complaints are disparaged. All complaints should be taken seriously.

The question then becomes.... what happens to those complaints when planes are not following the regulations of the Montgomery County Airpark?..... are pilots and/or flight schools spoken to.... Is written notice sent to the pilots, flight schools and/or those leasing planes? Are fines assessed or are pilots forbidden to fly if they disregard regulations? In fact, documents that have been received, indicate that one of the current tenants had 7 safety violations in 2021. Have those been addressed?

The community is told that MCRA's "hands are tied" and the Airpark is regulated by the FAA. However in the FAA document "Policy on Addressing Aircraft Noise Complaints and Inquiries from the Public" it states that "aircraft noise is a shared responsibility between airport authorities, airlines, state and local government, communities and the FAA. "

I would be happy to provide you with this document.

A second major issue is safety. How safe is it to have student pilots flying above our homes below acceptable altitudes, how safe is it with students flying so closely to each other in the flight pattern? And even if these are not students... how about the licensed pilots that don't follow regulations? Several years ago, I'm sure you remember the tragic accident when a low flying plane literally exploded into a home off of Snouffer School road killing a young mother and two of her three children. I was interviewed by a reporter from NBC news and the most "haunting" question he asked me was , "Were you surprised that this accident happened?" And I had to answer "No, The community had been voicing concerns on the safety of this airpark for many years." The NTSB investigated and determined the cause of the crash was pilot error. By the way, this same pilot had been involved in a minor crash at the Airpark a few years earlier. And after a few weeks, operations were back to "normal" at the airpark regardless of the request of the community to develop new safety standards.

This past winter a pilot flew below required altitude and was even given warnings that he was too low when he flew into the power lines off of Goshen Road....and it's a good thing the power lines stopped his flight because if not, then he would have flown into the homes of the Hunters Woods development right across Goshen Rd. The accident created power loss to hundreds of thousands of homes in Montgomery County. . Luckily no one was injured and the havoc that was created was repaired in about 12 hours. And by the way, this pilot was also involved in a prior accident.

In addition, there have been several minor accidents on the grounds of the Airpark.

Having lived in this community for so many years, I have watched the county approve residential and non residential construction literally up to the end of the runway...and in all honesty the pilots really have nowhere to fly that doesn't put the community at risk. The community not only includes thousands of homes, but many schools, many places of worship, many retail establishments and many government installations. And I just read that there is a request to approve a new residential development on the old Nike Site, off of Snouffer School Road...directly under the flight path of planes out of and into the Airpark...will the MCRA testify that this development should not be approved??

My guess is it will be approved.

You probably ask, what can the MCRA Board do about this and the many other issues that I don't have time to go into.

The Board can take their responsibilities on the Board seriously.... request data to back up reports that are presented, do research and ask for comments from impacted parties and communities and not just "rubber stamp" requests for funds, changes in policy or sign off on projects.

The communities surrounding the airpark are literally suffering and we ask that you take this into consideration.

I am more than happy to speak with you individually or as a group so we can have a meaningful and productive discussion.

I thank you for your time.

Nancy Shenk
Resident of Goshen Estates



Memorandum

To: Board of Directors

From: Keith Miller

Date: June 26, 2023

Re: Response to Airpark Community Testimony May 23, 2023

As per the Board's request, staff have reviewed Ms. Wallenmeyer and Ms. Shenk's testimony from the May 2023 board meeting. The following is staff's response to the key items and concerns raised.

Ms. Wallenmeyer's Testimony:

1. This airport has a problem. It is highly impactful upon the community, both with air pollutants, with toxic lead sold in aviation fuels, and with persistent noise pollution. The MCRA management fails to produce timely and thorough responses to requests for public records. The traffic pattern is frequently filled to an unsafe level, with students and recreational pilots. If and when an accident occurs, will MCRA and this Board be held accountable for failing to try to resolve these problems?

The MCRA and the Montgomery County Airpark are in compliance with all FAA and EPA noise and pollution regulations. We have responded to all requests for information in accordance with the Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA). We have received requests for information which we are not in possession of and therefore cannot provide. These issues have been handled with the MPIA Ombudsman. The Baltimore Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) has increased their surveillance of flight activity at the Airpark this year. They have come to the Airpark to listen to the radio communications and to visually monitor the aircraft in the pattern. In doing so, they have found no instances of unsafe flying practices. The FSDO is the only entity that is authorized to determine if pilots are in violation of Federal Aviation Regulations.

2. At a recent meeting, MCRA CEO Keith Miller requested your approval to pursue grants and construct a new hangar at the Airpark. Your minutes do not include any of the needed public information defining intended use or type of hangar to be built. We cannot properly engage the impacted community if we keep them in the dark, leaving out critical details in the minutes. Will you correct this deficiency?

Mr. Miller briefed the board on a funding opportunity for developing the North End of the Airpark through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Legislation. This area has been slated for new hangar construction

since the 1990's. The Board has not taken any action on the approval of this construction yet. In fact, for the MCRA to construct this project, it must be part of the Capital Improvement Plan. This requires staff to present the project as part of the program for a vote by the Board. The project would then be sent to the County Executive and finally to the County Council for approval.

It is important to note this and several other hangars on the North End are part of the current Airport Layout Plan. These hangars adjoin the ramp which was installed by the FAA and are critical to our Grant Assurances because it will provide competition on the airfield. Additionally, there is a large deficit of hangar space in the Greater DC metropolitan area with many years-long waiting list at the Montgomery County Airpark. At Frederick Airport, there are over 80 individuals on the waiting list, and this is similarly true for other airports in the area. The building out of the hangars on the North End of the Airpark has been on the approved Airport Layout Plan for over 20 years, and was developed with community input as per FAA advisory circular 150/5070.

3. Are you familiar with precisely how this airport is structured? It is set up very much like an undeclared public-private partnership. I have heard from many others who comment, the assortment of legal entities, the layers of leaseholders, and the refusal of MCRA officials to produce records, looks and feels like an elaborate shell game. There can be no transparency and no accountability, when MCRA officials fail to timely share records needed by impacted community members seeking to mitigate impacts. You, the Board, need to direct Keith Miller to produce for you a letter or diagram that concisely defines the entire organizational structure of this airport, from the top of MCRA down to each commercial operator, each flight school, each maintenance shop, each fuel seller. The listing needs to include the business names of each lease-holder, and identify the principal official and email address for each lease-holder. Also, if production of this airport organizational structure does in fact look problematic, like a shell game, we should be ready to clean that up, posthaste.

As the Board is aware, the MCRA has two leases at the Airpark. One with K&R Aviation (dba Open Air), which the board voted to approve a seven-year extension to their current lease at the May 23, 2023 board meeting. The second lease is with Montgomery County Airpark LLC (dba DC Metro Aviation), which is a 99-year lease that began in 1960. DC Metro Aviation's lease allows them to sublease space to provide all services required to successfully operate an airport. The master lease restricts information shared with MCRA, so a form license agreement was approved by the Board over ten years ago. Further, the Board has approved minimum standards at the Airpark which is a FAA recommended best practice for airports to encourage competition between businesses operating at an airport while maintaining non-discrimination requirements of the FAA Grant Assurances. A business must meet all of the minimum standards requirements to operate. The MCRA has produced copies of the two leases in our possession to the community.

4. With Airport Master Plans, FAA has a longstanding process to help airports remain compatible with the community. The Master Plan process engages community members, and the end products, including the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) are required for federal grant subsidies. FAA strongly recommends this process on a regular basis, even every 5-10 years, and FAA provides grant monies for this process. Do you know when the last Airport Master Plan process happened for this airport? Do you know the date on the last ALP version approved by FAA's Airports Office?

You should know all of this, and you should have ready access to copies of all the documents. And we the community residents should ALSO have ready access. Would you please direct Mr. Miller to provide these records, as well as a clear timeline defining our history of Master Plans, and the complete history of approved ALP revisions?

The current Airpark Layout Plan was created in 2002, it was updated in 2013, and it is tentatively scheduled for a full master plan process in 2032. The FAA does not require master plans, but it does recommend them, with no requirements on the frequency. MCRA has been in discussions with the Airport District Office of the Federal Aviation Administration to put a Master Planning effort into our Airport Capital Improvement Plan. However, since construction of projects at smaller airparks typically take longer to fund, it is common for airport layout plan updates to be less frequent. For example, we are still working to complete many of the initial projects called for in the 2002 Airport Layout Plan. For smaller airports, the Master Plan is titled Airport Layout Plan Update. The most current version is on our website and publicly available.

5. Do you know how much leaded aviation fuel was sold at this airport, each of the last five years? Should you know, and should the community also know, given the toxicity of lead, especially around children? Do you understand that MCRA has precise records on leaded fuel sales? MCRA raises airport revenues using a fuel flowage fee collected for each gallon of fuel flowed at the airport. We need to get rid of this lead pollution, but are we? Can we share real data showing progress (or lack of progress) on reducing leaded fuel sales?

The MCRA remains concerned about lead fuel and agrees with the community that the ultimate goal is elimination of leaded fuel. According to the FAA Grant Assurances, we cannot regulate or restrict leaded fuel sales. As previously discussed with the Board, the Montgomery County Council and the County Executive's office requested a lead study from the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) and MDE's response begins:

"In 2017, with the EPA's approval, the Department discontinued the one remaining lead monitoring site in Maryland due to levels consistently below the analytical method's detection limit. The Department no longer has the capability to conduct lead monitoring."

The MCRA receives ten cents per gallon for both Jet A and 100 low-lead gas sold at the Airpark. In response to MPIA requests, we have provided the community with monthly breakdowns of 100LL and Jet A fuel sales. The community will need to calculate to determine the gallons sold. Lastly, there is good news as the FAA announced the approval of unleaded gasoline across all piston aircraft. We are simply waiting for the infrastructure and production capacity to increase and for the fuel to be available.

6. Is this Board going to proactively advocate for restoring the ALC? The Airport Liaison Committee was abruptly disbanded when some of us began expressing our concerns. I was told by MCRA officials I ask that this Board advocate for restoring the ALC, and direct Mr. Miller to write a letter stating his position, for or against.

During the recent public testimony for Bill 23-24 Airpark Community Advisory Committee at the Montgomery County Council, we did explicitly state support of the committee. We also expressed our concerns over the committee's placement under Chapter 42 and added some clarity on the language of its members. We also met with Councilmember Luedtke's office (the bill sponsor) to express our concerns.

7. Are you familiar with the Vianair Report done in June last year? It offered some critiques and recommendations, including the need to restore the ALC. I ask that the Board direct Mr. Miller to prepare a statement declaring the MCRA response to the specific Vianair Report content, to include either explanations for how MCRA will address concerns and pursue recommendations, with a clear timeline showing how and when for each MCRA action. Where a report recommendation is being rejected, there needs to be an explanation of why.

Contrary to the statement above, the MCRA is working on implementing the Vianair report's recommendations. For example, we have renamed Runway 14 as the *preferred runway* as compared to its original title of calm wind runway. We are updating signage and pilot information to reflect the new language. Additionally, on page 23 of the report, it outlines 5 recommendations; establishment of a noise complaint management system, deployment of a flight tracking system, reestablishment of a roundtable or task group, establishment of a formal community and industry engagement program. The MCRA has created a noise complaint management system, is exploring flight tracking systems and is in support of the County Council's bill to establish a community group. Finally, the Vianair report is published on the website and the report was shared with the Board.

8. Lastly, to help reduce impacts and the heightened risk of overfilled air traffic patterns, I ask the Board to direct Mr. Miller to prepare an analysis of how we can impose a landing fee for all arrivals. For the record, in the recent past Mr. Miller has tried to discourage imposing a landing fee, even claiming they are not allowed by FAA. In fact, landing fees are allowable, so long as they do not discriminate unjustly. I have spoken with management at numerous airports where landing fees are imposed.

Landing fees are common at large commercial service airports. This type of fee is incompatible with what the Montgomery County Airpark means to the flying public and how it fits into the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems. Landing Fees would unjustly discriminate against those learning to fly thus making it against FAA grant assurances. Instead of a landing fee the Airpark has in our lease agreements a storage fee based on the maximum takeoff weight of the aircraft. This allows us to collect a fee without unjustly discriminating and it is typical for an airport to establish either a landing fee or storage fee.

Ms. Shenk's Testimony:

1. I am going to speak to you on two issues of grave concern to the community surrounding the Airpark, noise and safety.

Aviation noise is regulated by the FAA and supersedes local regulations. At the Airpark, we have signage on the taxiways and throughout the terminal area explaining the noise abatement procedures and our website. These are not regulations that can be enforced with fines and notices of violation. We do not have an air traffic tower and pilots must decide on which runway is in use. The MCRA can advise them but not force them to use one runway over another.

2. Mr. Miller even reported that there is no equipment and no one is responsible to report the exact number of flights in or out of the airpark or the altitude at which they fly...the numbers in the published reports are merely estimates and in many cases numbers provided by the flight schools. It is my understanding that the flight schools are required to provide data monthly on touch and go's... those numbers have not been made available to the community when requested and I question if that data is being provided regularly to the MCRA. Several residents surrounding the airpark regularly monitor the flights, in terms of number of flights, altitudes and flight patterns....but when that data is reported to the MCRA officials ,they are told that their data collection is not acceptable.

During the MCRA's public meeting with the FAA, the FAA expressed that they cannot rely on the data from flight tracking sites. Additionally, the below information is directly from a popular flight tracking website.

I believe I witnessed a traffic conflict, altitude deviation, or some other anomaly. Should I report it? [SHARE](#) | [BACK TO TOP](#)

Please don't. Rather, read the [terms of use](#) and understand that this data is for casual observation only and not for any operational purpose. FlightAware technology was not designed with the intent to observe safety or regulation anomalies, so please do not try to use it for that purpose.

Are displayed flight altitudes AGL (above ground level) or MSL (mean sea level)? [SHARE](#) | [BACK TO TOP](#)

Displayed altitudes are dependent on the data source for the position data. FlightAware receives many different types of altitude data, including uncorrected pressure altitude, corrected pressure altitude, [flight levels](#), GPS-based height above mean sea level (MSL) and GPS-based height above ellipsoid. Data received from the FAA or other air navigation service providers is typically MSL. ADS-B data is frequently height above ellipsoid but there are exceptions. In general, it is best to assume altitudes are uncorrected [pressure altitudes](#) (a variation of MSL). FlightAware does not display AGL altitudes.

The FAA position and these disclaimers provide the reasons why we cannot rely on this information. The Maryland Aviation Administration conducts traffic counts every two years to estimate the annual operations at the Airpark. We are exploring other methods to gather this information.

3. When I served on the ALC, noise and safety complaints were made directly to the MCRA. The committee was consistently told that no complaints had been filed. I later found out that the ALC had been misled.....community members were filing complaints, yet the committee was not provided that information. The community now has the ability to file noise complaints on line. However, the noise complaint website is often down. And when data is requested, the only data reported is from households that have filed multiple complaints. The households that only report 1 complaint are not included in the data. And the households that continually file complaints are disparaged. All complaints should be taken seriously.

For the record, the MCRA has never misled the Airpark Liaison Committee (ALC) and we object to that accusation. If statements like these are going to be made, we ask that the Board request residents to provide absolute data before the statement can stand. The reports to the community on the data includes all of the complaints and then highlights the percentage of the complaints received by houses filing multiple complaints versus those submitting one complaint. The MCRA reads every noise complaint submitted and takes them all seriously. Every new complainant receives an email response and Airpark Management responds to repeat complaints as necessary. This is the exact same method that the FAA uses to respond to resident complaints about noise. We track this information and provide the data at every meeting.

4. The question then becomes.... what happens to those complaints when planes are not following the regulations of the Montgomery County Airpark?..... are pilots and/or flight schools spoken to.... Is written notice sent to the pilots, flight schools and/or those leasing planes? Are fines assessed or are pilots forbidden to fly if they disregard regulations? In fact, documents that have been received, indicate that one of the current tenants had 7 safety violations in 2021. Have those been addressed?

The Baltimore FSDO is the only authority that can determine if a pilot has violated a Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR). The MCRA and Airpark Management does not have the authority to make this determination and/or issue fines or notices of violation. The FSDO has not informed the Airport Management of any safety violations at the Airpark. The Baltimore Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) has increased their surveillance of flight activity at the Airpark this year. They have come to the Airpark to listen to the radio communications and visually monitor the aircraft in the pattern. In doing so, they have found no instances of unsafe flying practices.

5. The community is told that MCRA's "hands are tied" and the Airpark is regulated by the FAA. However in the FAA document "Policy on Addressing Aircraft Noise Complaints and Inquiries from the Public" it states that "aircraft noise is a shared responsibility between airport authorities, airlines, state and local government, communities and the FAA. "

This document addresses best practices of a noise complaint system, which was used in the development of the noise complaint system that the MCRA has in place. Additionally, this document states, "The FAA does not use noise complaints, including the volume of noise complaints, to justify the need to alter current practices or alter existing procedures and routes."

6. A second major issue is safety. How safe is it to have student pilots flying above our homes below acceptable altitudes, how safe is it with students flying so closely to each other in the flight pattern? And even if these are not students... how about the licensed pilots that don't follow regulations?

During the public meeting with the FAA, the Eastern Region Director for the FAA expressed the importance of flight training to aviation. There are projected to be hundreds of thousands of pilots needed in the next few years. Each training aircraft at the Airpark has complete dual control systems with a certified flight instructor on board until such time as the student is signed off by a certified flight instructor to fly solo. This is all heavily regulated by the Federal Aviation Regulations. The Baltimore FSDO of the FAA has been increasing their surveillance of flight training at the Airpark and has found no instances of unsafe flying practices or violations of the minimum safe altitudes.